

Anomalous diffusion at the Anderson transitions

Tomi Ohtsuki

Department of Physics, Sophia University, Kioi-cho 7-1, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102, Japan

Tohru Kawarabayashi

Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Roppongi, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106, Japan

(October 6, 2018)

Abstract

Diffusion of electrons in three dimensional disordered systems is investigated numerically for all the three universality classes, namely, orthogonal, unitary and symplectic ensembles. The second moment of the wave packet $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle$ at the Anderson transition is shown to behave as $\sim t^a$ ($a \approx 2/3$). From the temporal autocorrelation function $C(t)$, the fractal dimension D_2 is deduced, which is almost half the value of space dimension for all the universality classes.

Metal-insulator transitions are one of the most extensively investigated subjects in condensed matter physics. Especially interesting is the quantum phase transition, where the transition is driven by changing the parameter of quantum systems instead of temperature. The Anderson transition [1,2] is a typical example, where extended electronic states become localized with the increase of disorder.

Much effort has been devoted to clarify the Anderson transition, both experimentally and theoretically. In the metallic regime where the electronic states are extended, the transition is defined by the vanishing conductivity σ as the strength of disorder W is increased. It is characterized by the critical exponent s as

$$\sigma \sim (W_c - W)^s, \quad (1)$$

with W_c the critical disorder. In the insulating regime where the states are localized, it is most clearly seen by the divergence of the localization length ξ_{loc} as

$$\xi_{\text{loc}} \sim (W - W_c)^{-\nu}. \quad (2)$$

From the one parameter scaling theory, [3,4] the exponent ν is related to s by the Wegner's scaling law, [5]

$$s = (d - 2)\nu, \quad (3)$$

d being the dimensionality of the system, and once ν is determined, we can predict the behavior of the conductivity near the Anderson transition.

The behaviors of the localization length and the conductivity are conjectured to be universal, i.e., ν does not depend on the detail of the system. They are determined only by the basic symmetry of the system under the operation of time reversal or spin rotation. [5,6] Systems with time reversal and spin rotation symmetry are called orthogonal ensemble, while those with only time reversal symmetry are called symplectic ensemble. Systems without time reversal symmetry are unitary ensemble.

The value of ν has been calculated for three dimensional system by using the finite-size scaling argument. It is estimated to be 1.4 ± 0.1 for orthogonal ensemble, [2] 1.3 ± 0.2 for unitary ensemble, [8–10] and again 1.3 ± 0.2 for symplectic ensemble. [11,12] These facts indicate that the critical behavior of conductivity as well as the localization length does not depend significantly on the symmetry of the system.

On the other hand, recent analyses on the energy level statistics at the Anderson transition show that the level statistics do depend on the symmetry of the system, though they are independent of system size or model. [11–21] This universal behavior is related to the scale invariance at the transition, where eigenfunctions show fractal structure. Peculiar behavior just at the transition is now attracting a lot of attention.

In this paper, we numerically discuss electron diffusion at the Anderson transition in three-dimensional (3D) disordered systems. The diffusion coefficient becomes size dependent

at the transition, which leads to the increase of the mean square diffusion length $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle$ as t^a with the exponent $a < 1$. [22] The return probability also decreases as power law, reflecting the fractal structure of the wave function. [23,24]

First we discuss the behavior of $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle$. As in the percolation theory, [25] let us assume the scaling form

$$\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle = Ct^{k_1} f((W_c - W)t^{k_2}). \quad (4)$$

In the metallic regime, $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle$ increases as $2dDt$ where D is the diffusion constant. It is related to the conductivity from the Einstein relation, and behaves as $(W_c - W)^s$. Therefore, $f(x)$ should be proportional to x^s in the limit of large x .

In the insulating regime, the wave packet ceases to diffuse if the diffusion radius becomes the order of localization length. Therefore we have $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle \sim \xi_{\text{loc}}^2 \sim (W_c - W)^{-2\nu}$ and $f(x)$ is proportional to $(-x)^{-2\nu}$ when $-x$ is large enough. From this argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 + sk_2 &= 1, \\ k_1 - 2\nu k_2 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and consequently

$$k_1 = \frac{2\nu}{s + 2\nu}, \quad k_2 = \frac{1}{s + 2\nu}. \quad (6)$$

Using the scaling relation $s = (d - 2)\nu$, we have

$$k_1 = \frac{2}{d}, \quad k_2 = \frac{1}{d\nu}. \quad (7)$$

We therefore expect

$$\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle \sim t^{2/d}, \quad (8)$$

at the Anderson transition ($W = W_c$).

At the transition, the wave function has fractal structure. In this situation, if the radius of the wave packet is r , the return probability $P(t)$ is proportional to r^{-D_2} . From (8), we have

$$P(t) \sim t^{-D_2/d}. \quad (9)$$

From the behavior of $P(t)$, we can determine the fractal dimension D_2 . This intuitive argument agrees with the more detailed analysis of the scaling behavior of the dynamical diffusion coefficient $D(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. [23,24]

In the actual simulation, we have adopted tight binding Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma, \sigma'} V_{i,\sigma;j,\sigma'} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma'} + \sum_{i,\sigma} W_i c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma}, \quad (10)$$

where i, j denote the lattice site, and σ, σ' the spin. In the orthogonal case, $V_{i,\sigma;j,\sigma'} = V\delta_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ is real, while $V_{i,\sigma;j,\sigma'}$ is $V \exp(i\phi_{i,j})\delta_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ with $\phi_{i,j}$ the Peierls phase factor in the unitary case. In both cases, no spin flip process is included. In the symplectic case, the hopping is described by

$$V_{i,\sigma;i-k,\sigma'} = V[\exp(-i\theta\sigma_k)]_{\sigma,\sigma'}, \quad k = \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}, \quad (11)$$

where σ_k 's are Pauli matrices. [11,26] We have assumed the simple cubic structure with the lattice constant taken to be unity. Only the nearest neighbor coupling is assumed. The site-diagonal potentials W_i are assumed to be distributed independently, and their distribution is taken to be uniform in the range $[-W/2, W/2]$.

Instead of diagonalizing the system directly, we solve numerically the time-dependent Schrödinger equations. [27,28] We evaluate the time-evolution operator $U(t) = \exp(-iHt/\hbar)$ by using the decomposition formula for exponential operators. [29] The n -th order decomposition U_n satisfies the condition

$$U(\delta t) = U_n(\delta t) + O(\delta t^{n+1}). \quad (12)$$

We have adopted the same forth-order decomposition, as in the previous papers, [27,28] given by

$$U_4 = U_2(-ipt/\hbar)U_2(-i(1-2p)t/\hbar)U_2(-ipt/\hbar) \quad (13)$$

with

$$U_2(x) \equiv e^{xH_1/2} \dots e^{xH_{q-1}/2} e^{xH_q} e^{xH_{q-1}/2} \dots e^{xH_1/2},$$

where $H = H_1 + \dots + H_q$ and $p = (2 - \sqrt[3]{3})^{-1}$. The decomposition is made so that each Hamiltonian $H_i (i = 1, \dots, q)$ should consist of commuting terms.

The actual simulations have been done in systems with $59 \times 59 \times 59$ lattice sites for orthogonal and unitary ensembles, while $69 \times 69 \times 69$ lattice sites are used to discuss the symplectic case. In each case, average over 10 independent realizations of random potentials has been performed. The initial wave packet is build by diagonalizing a spherical system with radius $R = 3$ located at the center of the whole system. We use the wave packet whose energy is closest to the band center.

To discuss the properties at the vicinity of the transition, we have set $W = W_c = 16.5V$ for orthogonal case. [2] In the unitary case we assume that the magnetic field is parallel to the z -direction, and the magnetic flux penetrating the x - y plane unit cell is set to be 0.1 times the flux quantum. The resulting critical disorder is $W = W_c = 17.8V$. [9] For the symplectic ensemble, we have set $\theta = \pi/6$ in (11) and W is again set to the critical value $W_c = 19.0V$. [11] The time step is chosen to be $\delta t = 0.2\hbar/V_1$ where V_1 is the hopping amplitude without spin flip process.

We first discuss the critical behavior of the second moment of the wave packet $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle$ defined as

$$\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle_c \equiv \langle t|\mathbf{r}^2|t \rangle - \langle t|x|t \rangle^2 - \langle t|y|t \rangle^2 - \langle t|z|t \rangle^2, \quad (14)$$

where $|t \rangle$ denotes the state at time t . In Fig. 1, we plot it as the function of time tV/\hbar for the three universality classes. The solid line corresponds to the orthogonal case, the broken line to the unitary, and the dotted line to the symplectic one. The standard deviations with respect to 10 realizations of random potential configurations are typically less than 5%. From these behavior, $\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle_c$ is estimated to increase as t^a , with $a = 0.67 \pm 0.02$ for orthogonal case, 0.66 ± 0.02 for unitary case and 0.69 ± 0.02 for symplectic case. The excellent agreement of a with $2/d = 2/3$ confirms the scaling form (4) and the scaling relation $s = (d - 2)\nu$.

[Fig. 1]

Now we discuss the return probability. In Fig.2, we plot the temporal autocorrelation function [30] $C(t)$ defined by the overlap function between the initial state and the state at time t as

$$C(t) \equiv \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt' |\langle t'|0 \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt' P(t'). \quad (15)$$

Average of $\log C(t)$ over 10 random potential configurations has been performed, and the standard deviation is indicated for orthogonal case (the standard deviations for the other cases are not shown but they are almost the same). From the asymptotic behavior, we estimate the fractal dimension D_2 as 1.5 ± 0.2 for orthogonal, 1.7 ± 0.2 for unitary and 1.6 ± 0.2 for symplectic case. In the case of orthogonal ensemble, the value 1.5 ± 0.2 agrees with the results obtained previously by the direct diagonalization. [24,31,32] Our new results for unitary and symplectic cases show that the fractal dimensionality D_2 does not depend strongly on the symmetry. The results are summarized in Table I.

[Fig. 2]

In conclusion, we have studied the diffusion of electron in 3D disordered systems at the Anderson transition by numerically solving the Schrödinger equation. The anomalous diffusion $\mathbf{r}^2(t) \sim t^{2/3}$ has been clearly observed, which is expected from the scaling form (4) and the scaling relation $s = (d - 2)\nu$. The fractal dimensionality D_2 is also estimated. For all three universality classes, D_2 is almost half the space dimension. It is interesting to note that the values D_2 for two dimensional Anderson transitions, namely the quantum Hall and symplectic systems, are almost the same as well (1.62 ± 0.02 for the former [33,34] and 1.66 ± 0.05 for the latter. [28,35]). As discussed by Brandes *et al.*, [24,36] the fractal properties are reflected in the temperature dependence of the inelastic scattering time τ_{in} at the Anderson transition in relatively high temperature. Our results for unitary and symplectic cases indicate that almost the same temperature dependencies are observed in all 3D Anderson transitions.

Finally, let us discuss the temperature dependence of the conductivity at the transition. By the anomalous diffusion, the relation between the inelastic scattering length l_{in} and the inelastic scattering time is modified to be

$$l_{\text{in}} \propto \tau_{\text{in}}^{1/3}. \quad (16)$$

Then the effective diffusion constant D_{eff} observed at finite temperatures is

$$D_{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{l_{\text{in}}^2}{\tau_{\text{in}}} \sim \tau_{\text{in}}^{-1/3}, \quad (17)$$

leading to $\sigma \sim \tau_{\text{in}}^{-1/3}$. At sufficiently low temperature, τ_{in}^{-1} is proportional to the temperature T . Experimentally observed $T^{1/3}$ behavior of the conductivity at the transition is thus consistent with the present scaling argument using the scaling relation $s = (d - 2)\nu$. It is recently suggested [37] that the scaling relation is modified in the interacting system where Anderson-Mott transition occurs. Careful investigation of the temperature dependence of the conductivity at the transition will clarify the nature of the transition.

The authors are grateful to Professor Yoshiyuki Ono and Dr. T. Brandes for fruitful discussions. This work is in part financed by the Grants-in-Aid 08740327 from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. The numerical calculations have been in part performed on a FACOM VPP500 of Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.W. Anderson: Phys. Rev. **109** (1958) 1492 .
- [2] B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon: Rep. Prog. Phys. **56** (1993) 1469.
- [3] E. Abrahams, P.W. Anderson, D.C. Licciardello and T.V. Ramakrishnan: Phys. Rev. Lett. **42** (1979) 673.
- [4] A. Kawabata: Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **84** (1985) 16.
- [5] F. Wegner: Z. Phys. **B25** (1996) 327; **B35** (1979) 4496.
- [6] S. Hikami, A. Larkin and Y. Nagaoka: Prog. Theor. Phys. **63** (1980) 707, S. Hikami: Phys. Rev. **B24** (1981) 2671.
- [7] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **47** (1981) 1546, Z. Phys. **B53** (1983) 1.
- [8] T. Ohtsuki, B. Kramer and Y. Ono: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 224.
- [9] M. Henneke, B. Kramer and T. Ohtsuki: Europhys. Lett. **27** (1994) 389.
- [10] J.T. Chalker and A. Dohmen: Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4496.
- [11] T. Kawarabayashi, T. Ohtsuki, K. Slevin and Y. Ono: Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** (1996) 3593.
- [12] E. Hofstetter: cond-mat/9611060.
- [13] B.I. Shklovskii, B. Shapiro, B.R. Sears, P. Lambrianides and H.B. Shore: Phys. Rev. **B47** (1993) 11487.
- [14] E. Hofstetter and M. Schreiber: Phys. Rev. **B48** (1993) 16979 ; **B49** (1994) 14726.
- [15] Y. Ono and T. Ohtsuki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62** (1993) 3813 .
- [16] I.Kh. Zharekeshev and B. Kramer: Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **34** (1995) 4361; Phys. Rev. **B51** (1995) 17239.

- [17] L. Schweitzer and I. Kh Zharekeshev: J. Phys. Condens. Matter **7** (1995) L377.
- [18] T. Ohtsuki and Y. Ono: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 4088.
- [19] S.N. Evangelou: Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 2550.
- [20] E. Hofstetter and M. Schreiber: Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 3137 .
- [21] M. Batsch, L. Schweitzer, I. Kh. Zarekeshev and B. Kramer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** (1996) 1552 .
- [22] Y. Imry: J. Appl. Phys. **52** (1981) 1817; Y. Imry, Y. Gefen and D.J. Bergman: Phys. Rev. **B26** (1982) 3436.
- [23] J. Chalker and G. Daniell: Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 593, J. Chalker: Physica **A167** (1990) 253.
- [24] T. Brandes, B. Huckestein and L. Schweitzer: to appear in Annalen der Physik
- [25] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony: *Introduction to percolation theory*, Taylor and Francis (1992).
- [26] K. Slevin, J-L. Pichard and P. A. Mello: J. Phys. 1 (France) **6** (1996) 529.
- [27] T. Kawarabayashi and T. Ohtsuki: Phys. Rev. **B51** (1995) 10897.
- [28] T. Kawarabayashi and T. Ohtsuki: Phys. Rev. **B53** (1996) 6975.
- [29] M. Suzuki; Phys. Lett. **A146** (1990) 319; J. Math. Phys. **32** (1991) 400; Phys. Lett. **A165** (1992) 387; J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** (1992) 3015; Commun. Math. Phys. **163** (1994) 491.
- [30] R. Ketzmerick, G. Petschel and T. Geisel: Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 695.
- [31] C.M. Soukoulis and E.N. Economou: Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 565.
- [32] M. Schreiber and H. Grussbach: Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 607.

- [33] H. Aoki: J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **16** (1983) L205; Phys. Rev. **B33** (1986) 7310.
- [34] B. Huckestein, B. Kramer and L. Schweitzer: Surf. Sci. **263** (1992) 125; B. Huckestein and L. Schweitzer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 713.
- [35] L. Schweitzer: J. Phys. Condens. Matter **7** (1995) L281.
- [36] T. Brandes, L. Schweitzer and B. Kramer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 3582; T. Brandes: Phys. Rev. **52** (1995) 8391.
- [37] D. Belitz and T.R. Kirkpatrick: Phys. Rev. **B52** (1995) 13922; T.R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz: Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 1178, cond-mat/9609211.

TABLES

TABLE I. Summary of the exponent a and the fractal dimensionality D_2 for three universality classes.

	orthogonal	unitary	symplectic
a	0.67 ± 0.2	0.66 ± 0.2	0.69 ± 0.2
D_2	1.5 ± 0.2	1.7 ± 0.2	1.6 ± 0.2

Figure captions

Fig. 1: The growth of the second moment $\langle r^2(t) \rangle_c$ of the wave packet. The solid line corresponds to the orthogonal case, the broken line to the unitary and the dotted line to the symplectic one. In large t regime, $t^{2/3}$ behavior is clearly seen.

Fig. 2: The time-dependence of the auto-correlation function $C(t)$. The bars around the data for orthogonal case indicate the standard deviation with respect to 10 realizations of random potential configurations. They are almost the same for all universality classes, so only those for the orthogonal case are shown for simplicity.

Fig. 1 Ohtsuki and Kawarabayashi




Fig.2 Ohtsuki and Kawarabayashi

